

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOHN ISAAC HARRIS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 20-cv-10922  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
COMMUNITY DISTRICT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

/

---

**ORDER (1) DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM  
JUDGMENT (ECF No. 57) AND (2) DENYING PLAINTIFF  
IN FORMA PAUPERIS STATUS ON APPEAL**

Plaintiff John Isaac Harris is a former employee of Defendant Detroit Public Schools Community District (the “DPSCD”). In this action, Harris brought several federal and state-law claims against the DPSCD and others. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.)

On February 8, 2022, the Court issued an order in which it, among other things, (1) granted Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and (2) denied Harris’ motions for summary judgment. (*See* Order, ECF No. 55.) The Court then entered judgment in favor of Defendants and against Harris. (*See* Judgment, ECF No. 56.)

Harris has now filed a motion for relief from judgment in which he asks the Court to reinstate his claims. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 57.) The Court has carefully

reviewed the motion and denies it. Harris has not shown any error in the Court's ruling. Instead, as he has done repeatedly throughout this case, he lodges *ad hominem* attacks on defense counsel, the Magistrate Judge, Court staff, and this Court. (*See id.*) As the Court has repeatedly told Harris, such allegations are baseless and have no place in this action. (*See, e.g.*, Order, ECF No. 27, PageID.27, PageID.680 ("Finally, throughout the filings discussed above, Harris has repeatedly questioned the motives and impugned the character of the assigned Magistrate Judge. Those personal attacks are groundless and have no place in this action. The Court has carefully reviewed Harris' submissions, and the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, and her rulings accurately state the law and fairly adjudicate Harris' requests. As this litigation continues, the Court will carefully, conscientiously, and fairly review any legal and/or factual arguments that Harris wishes to present. But the Court will not tolerate continued baseless assaults on the integrity of the assigned Magistrate Judge"); Order, ECF No. 55, PageID.1636 ("Indeed, the vast majority of Harris' objections and supplemental objections make no meaningful effort to show how the Magistrate Judge specifically erred in the R&R. Instead, he accuses Court staff of misconduct, attacks the qualifications and personal integrity of the Magistrate Judge, attacks the system of referring motions for a report and recommendation, and repeatedly refers to a supposed fraud that is being perpetrated on the Court. Harris' attacks on the Court, its employees, and the

R&R writ large are insufficient as a matter of law") (internal citations and footnote omitted).) Harris' motion for relief from judgment (ECF No. 57) is therefore **DENIED**.

Harris has also filed a request to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal. (*See* Req., ECF No. 59.) A court may grant *in forma pauperis* status on appeal if it finds that an appeal could be taken in good faith. *See Foster v. Ludwick*, 208 F.Supp.2d 750, 764-65 (E.D. Mich. 2002); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R.App.24 (a). Here, an appeal could not be taken in good faith. As explained above, Harris has not provided any substantive arguments to support his claims. Instead, he has repeatedly attacked the integrity and qualifications of defense counsel, the Magistrate Judge, the Court's staff, and the undersigned. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Harris *in forma pauperis* status on appeal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: February 22, 2022

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on February 22, 2022, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126